

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 24 JUNE 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Brett Webber, SPG3
Richard Gelber, SPG3
Kurt Blorstad, Baywood Hotels
Ryan Shaw, Plan Philly
Rich Thom, Richard Thom, AIA
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Campbell
David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab
Claire Donato, MBTA
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Frank Gould
Vesna Hess
Tuval Shlomo
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Eve Parrot, SGRA
Jessica Baumert, The Woodlands
Inga Saffron, Inquirer

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 228-38 N 13TH ST

Project: Construct nine-story addition on building

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Foundation for BBBSA

Applicant: Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr, LLP

History: 1946; Warner Brothers Film Distribution Center; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 5/9/2008

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes in concept to construct a nine-story addition on the two-story building at 228-38 N. 13th Street. The building would be converted from offices to a hotel. The building is bounded by 13th Street at the east, Florist Street at the south, Clarion Street at the west, and a private alley at the north. The historic building has a flat roof with small penthouse at the northwest corner. The east and south facades as well as a return on the north façade are finely finished. The west and north facades are utilitarian. There is an open loading dock and parking area at the rear or west.

The Art Moderne building was constructed by architect William H. Lee in 1946 as the Warner Brothers Film Exchange Building. It contained offices and a film vault and served as the regional distribution center for Warner Brothers movies in the mid Atlantic. Several other movie studios maintained film exchange buildings in the area of 13th and Vine Streets until the 1950s, when the movie studio system collapsed. The building was later occupied by an insurance company, film production company, and non-profit organization. It was individually designated in 2008 for its architectural and historical significance. The interior is not designated and not under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

The application proposes to construct a nine-story addition on the two-story building. The addition would be clad in cementitious panels and have aluminum powder-coated windows with integrated louvers. The addition would extend onto the open area at the rear, where it would house an automated parking system. The front and south facades of the historic building would be restored. New signage in the style of the original signage would replace non-historic signage. The alley at the north would be gated at 13th Street. An enclosed loading area would be constructed at the west end of the alley.

An in concept review cannot lead to a building permit, but is instead a mechanism for providing advice to an applicant. In this case, the review should address the question of whether any overbuild would be acceptable on this building. The assessment of the details of this particular design such as cladding materials and window configuration are secondary to the assessment of the massing and other primary architectural aspects. Essentially, one must ask: Is it possible to construct an addition on this building that will not preclude the building from continuing to convey its significance to the public as indicated in the nomination? The Commission designated the building for its architectural significance and for its contribution to the regional movie distribution industry. Although this application makes no claims about the financial viability of this building, the Historical Commission should always consider the long-term sustainability of the resource when reviewing such applications. This building was constructed in 1946, at the start of the deindustrialization and depopulation of the city. It is a low-density, low-rise building on a large Center City lot close to the newly expanded convention center. For this building to be sustainable in the long term, it is likely that it will need to be enhanced, perhaps

with an addition. It would appear that there is little or no market for the two stories of Class C office space this building currently offers.

The staff contends that, owing to the configuration of this building including its architectural style, flat roof, large floor plate, and division of exterior into primary and secondary facades, this building can accept an appropriately designed overbuild without sacrificing its architectural integrity or historical significance. Rehabilitation Standard 9, by which the Historical Commission must be guided, stipulates that:

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Given the configuration of this building, an addition should be able to be designed that will not destroy historic materials and features, which are limited to the east and south facades as well as the return on the north. Therefore, the challenges will be confronted when making design decisions about the size, scale and proportion, and massing of an addition that will maintain and not obscure the historic spatial relationships of the original building to the street and sky.

The staff contends that the addition as currently proposed is not appropriate for the historic building because it has a massiveness that appears to overwhelm the historic building. The massing of the addition should be redesigned, perhaps by increasing the setbacks from the front and south façades and/or reducing its height. For example, the depth of the return of the historic façade from 13th Street on the north may delineate an appropriate setback for the addition from the front façade. Also, according to Standard 9, an appropriate addition should be differentiated from the historic building, but simultaneously compatible with it. The style and materials of the addition as proposed appear to have little in common with the historic building. It should be redesigned in such a way that its architectural characteristics enhance the public's understanding and appreciation of the historic building. In conclusion, the staff contends that this building can accept a fairly large addition that is compliant with the Standards, but the addition as proposed does not achieve compliance. If the building is not financially viable without such an addition, the applicant should seek an exemption from compliance with the Standards through the Historical Commission's hardship process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Matt McClure, hotel developer Kurt Blorstad, and architects Bret Webber and Richard Gelber represented the application.

Mr. Farnham distributed letters from the Preservation Alliance and Howard Haas regarding the application to the members of the Architectural Committee.

Mr. McClure observed that this is an in-concept application and his team is seeking advice and guidance. He reported that he met with the staff and the Preservation Alliance before submitting the application and received constructive comments. He asked the Committee to provide comments on the massing and materials and noted that they would likely revise the design based on the comments and submit it for a subsequent review. He explained that his client, Baywood Hotels, owns 70 hotels on the East Coast. The company develops and operates

hotels for various flags. He noted that a flag has not yet been selected for this hotel, but they are looking at boutique brands within the Hilton and Marriot chains.

Mr. Webber explained that the brands they are considering service a clientele that appreciates Modernism. He stated that they are considering this building because of its particular architectural style, which would appeal to the targeted guests. He stated that he and his clients appreciate the architectural character of the building and seek to develop a hotel that takes advantage of that style and character. He remarked that they would restore the character-defining facades and install new signage that was in keeping with the original signage and style of the building. He stated that the addition would be compatible with the historic building, but would be constructed of contemporary materials. Mr. Webber displayed the architectural plans for the rehabilitated building with addition. He pointed out the various spaces within the repurposed building. He stated that the existing, original door and window openings would be maintained at the primary facades and the windows would be retained. The main door, which is not original, would be made accessible and any new entranceway elements would match the historic elements as closely as possible. A plaza would be created at the north. Parking would be located in the basement and accessed at the rear with an automobile elevator. The addition would be set back from the north, east, and south facades of the building. The addition would be vertically oriented to differentiate it from the horizontal base. The addition would be separated into two sections on the front façade by glazed corridors running east-west on every floor. The addition would be articulated where it connects to the historic building to disengage the new from old. The buff-brick color of the historic building would be echoed in the materials of the addition. A panelized system was chosen for the cladding of the addition to give the addition a lighter sense and to differentiate it from the base. Mr. Webber displayed elevation drawings of the proposed facades. He pointed out the proposed canopy at the entrance on 13th Street. He noted the proposed signage at the parapet on the addition. He displayed perspective renderings of the proposed building.

Ms. Pentz asked about the structure of the addition. Mr. Webber stated that the addition would have an entirely new structural system that would sit within the footprint of the building. He stated that the existing layout of the interior spaces, which are on several levels connected by ramps and stairs, is not conducive to a hotel. Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Webber if he has developed a plan to support the historic building while the addition is inserted. He responded that they have developed a plan to support the building while they construct the addition.

Ms. Gutterman asserted that “the massing of the building is too large.” She stated that the addition is not set far enough back from the primary facades. She stated that the addition should be set back more to acknowledge the historic building. Ms. Stein agreed with Ms. Gutterman and added that she finds the addition too massive. She suggested reducing the width of the front façade and increasing the height of the addition. She contended that a taller, slimmer addition would have less of an impact on the historic building. She contended that the width and square shape of the addition detract from the historic building. A narrower, more slender addition would be more appropriate. Mr. Webber stated that, from an economic perspective, the corridor in the addition must be double loaded, thereby defining the width of the addition. However, he acknowledged the remarks and offered to study the design to try to make the addition more slender. He noted that the proposed design satisfies the zoning at the site; a taller building would not. Mr. McClure explained that the FAR for the site is 5; with bonuses for underground parking and LEED certification, they are boosting the FAR to 7.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the articulation between the historic building and addition. He noted that it is asymmetrical and is weighted to the south. Mr. Webber agreed that it is emphasized at the south and not north and noted that he designed it as such to echo the asymmetry of the front façade of the historic building. Mr. Gelber observed that the design of the addition is intended to refer to the asymmetry of the front façade of the historic building. Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged the reference and noted the “wonderful slip and slide” of the front façade of the historic building. He stated that the base of the building reminds him of the base of the PSFS Building at 12th and Market Streets. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, unlike the PSFS Building, in this case the addition is not sufficiently related to the base. He contended that there needs to be a “conversation” between the base and addition. They need to better relate to one another. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Stein that the addition would better fit with the base if it was narrower and taller. The relationship between the addition and base could be better controlled if the addition was taller and narrower, he claimed. Mr. D’Alessandro agreed. He stated that a large addition would be appropriate on this building, but it should better relate to the base. He objected primarily to the width of the currently proposed addition. He contended that, if it were narrower, even if taller, it could be appropriate. He also suggested setting the addition back farther from the main facades. Mr. Webber agreed to reconsider the design, but noted that hotels are based on a 60-foot standard module from which it is difficult to deviate. Mr. D’Alessandro opined that it may be necessary to break from standards when working with historic buildings. Hotels have very strict standards regarding room size, Mr. Webber noted. Ms. Hawkins disagreed with her colleagues and contended that a taller, thinner addition would not be appropriate. She asserted that some design guidelines for additions on historic buildings would dictate that no addition on this building should be more than one or two stories tall and that the addition should be set back from the primary facades a dimension that is at least as large as the height of the addition above the roofline. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that the location and building are challenging to work with, but asserted that the proposed addition does not fit the design guidelines she would employ in this circumstance. Mr. McClure asked Ms. Hawkins to take the significance of the building into account when judging the proposed application. He commented that “not all buildings are created equally.” He observed that some on the Commission, even the chair of the Committee on Historic Designation, conceded at the time of designation that this building was not especially significant. He suggested that the Commission and Architectural Committee account for relative significance when considering applications for alteration. He stated that he believes that this building can accommodate a rather large addition. He offered to have his design team revise the design based on the constructive comments offered by the Committee and then present those revisions at a subsequent meeting.

Ms. Pentz stated that she found the “hard corner” of the addition, which stands above the curving corner of the historic building to be “jarring.” Mr. Webber stated that he was willing to consider revisions of that aspect of the design of the addition, but also contended that the sharp corner of the addition accentuated the curved nature of the historic building. He suggested that it would be inappropriate to simply mimic the curved corner on the new addition. Mr. McClure added that they would happily reconsider that aspect of the design. Ms. Hawkins suggested moving the addition to the north, but acknowledged that building on the property line may result in window problems. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the core could be moved to the north. Mr. McClure again offered to study the suggestion, but noted that locating windows at or near the property line can be difficult.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia paraphrased the letter his organization submitted to the Committee. He stated that the application should be denied. He stated that he found that the Committee members provided good advice for revising the design to make it more appropriate. He contended that recommending denial of this application would not preclude the subsequent review of a revised application.

Richard Thom introduced himself as an architect and explained that he has worked on the building in question. He claimed that this proposal is “essentially a facadectomy.”

Mr. McClure reminded the Committee that the application is in concept and requested that the Committee not formally recommend approval or denial, but instead formulate a recommendation to the Commission that enumerates its advice or suggestions for improving the application. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham whether the Committee was obligated to recommend approval or denial. Mr. Farnham replied that the Committee has latitude with review in concept applications, which cannot lead to the issuance of building permits. He stated that the Committee may formally recommend approval or denial or may offer its advice and guidance. He contended that approval and denial have little meaning for in concept applications, since there is no authorization for a building permit to approve or deny with an in concept application, which is only a request for advice and guidance. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. McClure about his plans for the next step of the review. Mr. McClure responded that his team will attempt to revise the design as recommended by the majority of Committee members. He observed that he would present the revisions to the Commission if they are completed in time. He stated that he is seeking advice at this time, not an approval that will lead to a permit. Ms Gutterman asserted that the Committee should recommend denial of the design as submitted and noted that the Committee has offered extensive guidance and advice to improve the design. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted.

ADDRESS: 208, 210, AND 212 VINE ST, 207, 209, AND 211 NEW ST

Project: Construct four-story addition on rear garages; restore facades; construct stair tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Stortz

Applicant: Eve Parrot, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History:

208 Vine, 1780, Contributing; 210 Vine, 1885, Contributing; 212 Vine, 1760, Contributing
207 New, 1940, Non-contributing; 209 and 211 New, 1925, Contributing

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the renovation of the three buildings facing Vine Street and the construction of a large addition on garage or light industrial buildings at the rear of the site, facing New Street. This application is a revision of an application that was presented to the Architectural Committee in May 2014, but withdrawn before the June 2014 meeting of the Historical Commission.

The Vine Street facades would be restored. The plans indicate two decks on the rear ells of the Vine Street buildings. A new stair tower would be built behind two Vine Street properties in an area that was originally open but later infilled with industrial structures.

The application proposes the construction of a four-story addition on top of the garage-like structures facing New Street, which connect to the rears of the Vine Street structures. The building to the east on New Street is classified as non-contributing in the district inventory, while the building to the west is classified as contributing. In fact, both of these structures are really interconnected appendages of the older buildings on Vine Street. The inventory mistook them for independent structures. The facades of the garage-like structures would be retained. At the building to the east, the roll-down garage door would be replaced by a glazed entry and a new garage entrance would be inserted into its longer, east-facing facade. Above the garages, the addition would be clad in stucco and have punched openings with small-pane industrial windows. The design has been revised since the last review to call out lintels and sills at the windows and more detail for a cornice as well as the transition between the garage and the new structure above. The small windows above the garage have been removed as suggested by the Architectural Committee.

Although the application indicates that the Vine Street facades would be restored, the plans lack details of this work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6, 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and intern Eve Parrot represented the application.

Committee members asked many questions about the work to the older properties on Vine Street. Ms. Hawkins asked about the path of the new stair, which did not appear to make sense in the drawings. Ms. Gutterman asked about the windows on the side of the building that seemed inconsistently drawn on the architectural plans and elevations. She also questioned the placement of the mechanical equipment. Ms. Stein asked whether the interior layout of the bedrooms was workable, given that some of the top-floor spaces were under the eaves, providing insufficient headroom. The Committee members also expressed concerns about the various floor heights and the impact those might have on window openings.

Mr. Rosenberg explained that the new stair will not extend above the roofs of the rear ells of the Vine Street properties. He claimed that they would not change the masonry openings of any windows on the Vine Street buildings. The mechanical equipment would be placed on an existing one-story addition at the back of 212 Vine Street. He opined that some of the attic spaces will make small but appealing bedrooms. He said that the front facades are pulling away from the buildings and need to be tied back. He reported that the facades would be restored with the removal of stucco. He added that the staff would be asked to review masonry restoration samples.

Mr. Baron asked about the proposed work to the dormers. Mr. Rosenberg said that he would be retaining and restoring the existing dormers with new windows, clapboards, and roofing.

The Committee members stated that they appreciated the improvements to the addition proposed for New Street implemented since the last Architectural Committee review of this project.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance contended that the proposed construction for the southern half of the site on New Street could be viewed from a regulatory perspective as an addition to the New Street buildings, an addition to the Vine Street buildings, or new construction in its own right. He asked the Committee to clarify the regulatory context within which the Commission would review the application.

Richard Thom, an architect with his office in the Old City neighborhood, stated that he had previously surveyed these buildings for the owner. He agreed that the old structures are in very poor condition with facades pulling away. He claimed that the buildings need a project like this addition to save them.

Mses. Gutterman and Hawkins both asserted that this application left too many questions unanswered for a final approval. They noted that, although Mr. Rosenberg had clarified some issues verbally, the application should clearly document the proposed project without contradictions. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro countered that, although there are still some issues requiring resolution, the overall design is acceptable and will result in the preservation of the very significant structures on Vine Street. Disagreeing with Mses. Gutterman and Hawkins, they contended that the open issues were relatively minor and could be resolved with the staff.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the Committee adopt the staff recommendation. He noted that the staff could refer the application back to Architectural Committee and Commission if the open issues could not be resolved to mutual satisfaction. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Ms. Hawkins suggested amendments to the proposed recommendation. She contended that no masonry openings on the Vine Street buildings should be modified except at the stair tower; that the dormers should be retained and repaired; and that samples of stucco should be removed at the three Vine Street buildings for the staff to review. The Committee members agreed with her amendment to the proposed recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided no masonry openings on the Vine Street buildings are modified except at the stair tower; that the dormers are retained and repaired; and that samples of stucco are removed at the three Vine Street buildings for review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 1916 DELANCEY PL

Project: Reconstruct roof, add deck with pilothouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Naples

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA Design Associates, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of the existing roof structure and installation of a new roof deck with pilot house. The application proposes the reframing of the roof because the existing roof would be unable to support the loads required by code for a deck. The new roof framing would also be lower than the existing roof, making the proposed deck and pilot house less visible from 19th Street. The proposed roof deck railing would be set back five feet from the front façade, and would be constructed of black metal. The proposed pilot house would be clad in stucco, with an asphalt shingle roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a mock up shows the deck and pilot house are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hyon Kang represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the placement of the railing along the rear parapet. Mr. Kang noted that, if the current placement is a problem, it could be pulled back away from the wall. Ms. Hawkins opined that the deck is very large, noting that it appears to be 30 feet in length. Mr. Kang confirmed this estimate. Mr. Kang noted that there are currently condensers located on the roof, which would need to be relocated, possibly to the rear of the roof.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee does not typically recommend approval for decks located on the main block of a building. Ms. DiPasquale commented that there is no rear ell for this building, and that it is a flat roof, rather than a gabled or hipped roof. Mr. Kang noted that there is currently a slight pitch to the roof, and that by reframing the roof, it allows the deck to be lowered by approximately two feet, as the roof would be lowered to approximately the height of the lowest point of the current pitch.

Ms. Stein asked about the decking material, and Mr. Kang responded that they are open to suggestions, but currently proposing a polyaspartic material which acts as a waterproofing membrane, can be finished, and is non-slip. Ms. Stein asked him to clarify that the roof itself would be able to be walked upon with this finish, as opposed to needing additional deck material. Mr. Kang confirmed that the roofing material is designed to support such use and no additional decking is proposed, as they are trying to minimize the height of the structure. He further noted that the proposed material is more pliable than fiberglass and has a nearly infinite lifespan.

Ms. Hawkins questioned the proposed railing material. Mr. Kang responded that they are currently proposing black metal, but are open to a grey metal with a matte finish.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment; no one offered comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock up shows that no portion of the railing or pilot house is visible from Delancey Place, that the rear railing is pulled back from the parapet wall, and that the mechanical equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2426 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patrick and Shanley Campbell

Applicant: Patrick Campbell

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story rear addition with balcony and roof deck, and restore the front façade with new windows, entrance door and steps.

The proposed rear addition would involve the removal of an existing one-story rear addition and historic rear wall, but would retain the existing rear cornice and would not change the existing roof. The proposed rear addition would be partially visible from S. 25th Street, outside the historic district, but not from Pine Street, and would have a stucco exterior. A small rear balcony with metal railing is proposed for the second story of the addition.

Restoration of the front façade, including new windows, entrance door and steps is included in this application, the details of which can be reviewed by the staff.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect David Whipple and homeowner Patrick Campbell represented the application.

Mr. Campbell explained that the proposed first-floor addition would be used as a sitting room and fourth-floor space as a family room. Ms. Stein asked if there are other homes on the 2400 block of Pine Street that have a fourth-floor addition in the rear that projects out beyond the face of the other adjoining buildings. Mr. Whipple responded that there are no examples of single family homes, but there is a larger condominium complex on the 2300 block that is five stories tall. Mr. Campbell referenced the Horn Mansion, which is located on the 2400 block of Pine Street. Ms. Stein explained that the Committee typically recommends approval of rear additions that sit below the cornice line, but noted that this proposed addition extends up a complete story above the cornice. She stated that the massing of the addition would be quite large. Mr. Campbell responded that he understood her concern, but that the fourth story is pulled back about ten feet from the historic building so that it is very removed from the historic building and is not visible from Pine Street. Mr. Whipple explained that there are low floor-to-ceiling heights on the second and third stories of the house, and the third story of the addition would not be

usable if the roof has to be dropped. Mr. Whipple clarified that the addition would not be visible from Pine Street, but that the rear addition would be visible from S. 25th Street. Ms. Hawkins asked if there is a street behind Pine Street. Mr. Campbell responded that there is only an alleyway behind his property, which is city-owned for phone line purposes and is not accessible to the public. He also added that the fourth story has a lower floor-to-ceiling height than that found in new construction, and that the height of his proposed four-story addition might be equivalent to that of a three-story new construction, owing to the high ceiling heights typically used in new construction. Ms. Hawkins opined that it is difficult to review a proposal for an addition that is larger than the historic building, because her tendency is to think of an addition as subservient in all ways. She elaborated that this would mean an addition that is smaller in scale and a different material. Ms. Hawkins stated that this proposed addition is in essence a rear ell for which that applicant is proposing an addition on top. She noted that the floor-to-ceiling heights are challenged in this project, but that the Committee typically encourages additions that remain below the eave, which may be more of a sloped configuration like a traditional ell, with a smaller pilot house that offers access to a roof deck.

Ms. Stein asked about the condensing units that are shown on top of the fourth floor. Mr. Whipple responded that the units can be placed elsewhere. Mr. Campbell asked if the units could be placed in the rear yard. Ms. Stein responded that the rear yard is a fine location, as would be a location on the roof that is not visible from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the degree to which the addition would be visible from S. 25th Street. Mr. Campbell responded that one would have to look straight down the alleyway from S. 25th Street, and that it would be the same depth as the addition that is three houses further east, but that it would go about eight feet higher than that addition. Mr. Whipple directed Ms. Gutterman to look at the renderings in his application packet to see visibility from S. 25th Street, and estimated that there is a 15 to 20 foot section of visibility from S. 25th Street.

Ms. Hawkins opened the discussion to the public. Frank Gould, the next door neighbor at 2428 Pine Street, prefaced his comments by acknowledging that they are largely related to light and air instead of historic preservation. His main concern is related to the size and scope of the addition as it relates to the historic building, and how it will impact his ability to enjoy his property as much as he currently does. He suspects that his property will now have no sunlight during the morning hours for any south-facing window or door. He stated that he has no issues with the applicant constructing a rear addition, but is simply concerned about the size and scope. He estimated that the proposed addition will extend nine feet past his rear addition, which will mean that his third floor deck will have a wall to the east. He stated that the larger rear additions on the east end of the block were all constructed prior to the designation of the historic district. Ms. Hawkins responded that his concerns are not specifically the purview of the Architectural Committee, but that the concerns can be brought up to the Historical Commission. She explained that the Committee is looking at the appropriateness of the addition architecturally, and its impact on historic fabric.

Ms. Gutterman suggested a recommendation of approval, provided that the fourth story is reduced to a pilot house instead of a penthouse. Ms. Hawkins responded that the motion needs to address the application submitted. Ms. Gutterman then suggested denial of the application as presented, but acknowledged that a three-story addition with a pilot house and a set-back deck and a railing would be appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey seconded her suggestion. Ms. Pentz, Stein, and Hawkins agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro did not express an opinion. Ms. Hawkins

explained to the applicants that they can revise their drawings to show a three-story addition with a pilot house, with a deck and a railing that is set back. Mr. Whipple asked if those revisions would allow for a staff-level review. Ms. Hawkins responded that the project would still need to be reviewed by the Historical Commission, and that she will attend that meeting and explain the Architectural Committee's position.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 316 S 21ST ST

Project: Add bay window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William & Vesna Hozack

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects

History: 1860; mansard added 1880s; refaced 1949; rehabbed 1994 by Otto Sperr

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story bay on the second and third floor of the 21st Street elevation on this rowhouse in Rittenhouse Square. An application for a bay addition was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its May 2014 meeting, but was withdrawn before a review by the Historical Commission. The previously-proposed bay was clad in brick and would have required the alteration of the existing historic cornice. This revised application reflects the Architectural Committee's comments proffered at the May meeting, and is now wood and does not require alteration of the cornice.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jim Campbell, contractor Tuval Shlomo, and owner Vesna Hess-Hozack represented the application.

Mr. Campbell concurred with the staff overview. He observed that the Architectural Committee provided many good suggestions when it reviewed an earlier version of this proposal last month. He stated that they modified their proposal based on those suggestions. Mr. Campbell stated that the façades of the front block of the house were strangely rebuilt in 1949. He reported that, at that time, the windows were oddly sized, unusual lintels and sills were added, and the main entrance was moved around the corner to the rear ell. The main block of the house has no door and small windows. He stated that the building is classified as Contributing to the district. It retains its historic mansard roof. Mr. Campbell stated that they hope to construct this bay to provide better light and air and some additional space on the interior. Mr. Campbell stated that their original preference was for the square brick bay, which was previously proposed. Ms. Hess-Hozack stated that she would likewise accept the wood bay, which is currently proposed, and she acknowledged the Committee's earlier comments about a brick bay appearing heavy.

Ms. Stein opined that any bay on this façade would be inappropriate. She stated that the cornice looks authentic. She stated that the bay is in conflict with and a distraction from the historic cornice above. Ms. Stein suggested that increasing the sizes of the non-historic window openings in the main block would be more appropriate. Ms. Stein stated that she is concerned that an approval would be precedent setting.

Ms. Hess-Hozack stated that, with the kitchen being on the second floor, the only appropriate play space for their growing family would be on the second floor. She stated that this bay is an attempt to gain some space and light for the children.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 3900 WOODLAND AVE

Project: Install ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Woodlands Cemetery Company

Applicant: Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates LLC

History: 1742; Woodlands, Estate of Andrew Hamilton; expanded 1770-1790

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes exterior alterations to the terrace structure on the north side of the Woodlands and its underlying brick arched cryptoporticus passage. The application proposes structural repairs that will allow for the removal of the temporary shoring which currently provides the means of support for the terrace, as well as the rehabilitation of the terrace surface treatments and improvements to the building drainage. Additionally, the application also proposes a new walkway along the east side of the building to improve drainage and expose window sills and sash that have been partially buried below grade, as well as provide ADA access to the cryptoporticus and basement. Further, the application proposes site utility improvements including a new sewer connection to the Philadelphia Water Department sewer located within a right-of-way on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Claire Donato and Jessica Baumert, executive director of the Woodlands, represented the application.

Ms. Cote informed the Committee that she met with the applicants and reviewed the proposal. Most of the proposed work falls within the staff's authority to approve, excepting the east walkway for ADA access, which is the question before the Committee today.

Ms. Donato stated that it is the ultimate goal of the Woodlands to restore the building back to the 1813 to 1850 period. She stated that this partial re-grading on the east side not only will address degradation of fabric that they have been attempting to mitigate, but will also allow for interpretation of the Hamilton-era grading while generally maintaining the appearance of the existing grade. She stated that this will also help with conservation as storm water will be routed

into the existing drainage system. She stated that the walkway would be concrete; the exposed wall would be brick with a stone cap.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the wall of the building once it becomes exposed with the change in grade. Ms. Donato stated that the newly-exposed section will have the appearance of the west wall, which is an exposed water table that extends through the cryptoporticus.

Ms. Pentz asked about any existing structures at the location of the proposed walk. Ms. Donato stated that there is grading, a small brick retaining wall and stairs to the cryptoporticus. Ms. Baumert explained that the re-grading, pulling the earth away from the building and installing the walkway with drainage, would be good for the building. She stated that, currently, the basement is very damp and the plaster and windows along this wall have deteriorated from the moisture.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:47 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

DRAFT